



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

By nothing is this transition more marked than by the political machine which John of Gaunt was able to create. "The Duke of Gaunt," Mr. Trevelyan writes, "was at the head of a small but well-organized hierarchy of knaves who made a science of extorting money from the public by a variety of ingenious methods." The duke and his friends in the Royal Council used their official positions in precisely the same way that the officials of some of our cities use theirs. The existence of a well-organized boss system at that time was much more strange and anomalous than is Tammany Hall in an era where the commercial ideal is predominant. It shows that in the days of Edward III the religious and military ideals of mediævalism were giving way to aims essentially characteristic of modern times.

In nearly all respects Mr. Trevelyan is well adapted for a successful accomplishment of his self-imposed task. To a thorough knowledge of the original authorities is joined the ability to classify and digest the raw facts. And then Mr. Trevelyan has the literary gift so characteristic of his family. His able presentation of the facts and the literary form of his work are fully worthy of the two historians who preceded him. In addition, Mr. Trevelyan's scholarship is the better, just in proportion as our historical methods are better than those of preceding generations. This union of science and art has produced what may be called the best book on English history of recent years. Other books may have added more to our knowledge; but as a history from the broadest standpoint, as a book to be read as well as to be studied, few can challenge comparison with this work of Mr. Trevelyan.

GEORGE LOUIS BEER.

A Constitutional History of the American People (1776-1850).

By FRANCIS NEWTON THORPE. New York and London, Harper & Brothers, 1898. — xxvii, 486 pp.; xv, 520 pp.

The True History of the Missouri Compromise and its Repeal.

By MRS. ARCHIBALD DIXON. Cincinnati, The Robert Clarke Company, 1899. — xii, 623 pp.

A History of the Presidency. By EDWARD STANWOOD, Litt.D.

Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1898. — iv, 586 pp.

In a way, and in a certain very important way, Professor Thorpe's *Constitutional History* is one of the most valuable books on the subject that has ever come within the scope of my reading. It contains within the limits of about one thousand pages more of the constitutional facts of American history than I have ever before seen brought

together in double the space. In fact, I do not think there is another book upon the subject, no matter how extensive, that contains an equal amount of such valuable matter for the political history of this country. Mr. Thorpe has analyzed and presented the main features of all the constitutions established in the United States during the seventy-five years of which he treats, and has added much from such statute law as is fundamental in its nature.

So far as I have verified his citations, in examining his work, I have found them correct. On the other hand, I have found his arrangement of topics somewhat confusing; and in regard to a few subjects I have not found his conclusions convincing. Some of his postulates also appear to me to be crude, if not erroneous. When, for example, he affirms, in speaking of the political ideas of 1776, that "the national idea which now prevails was then unheard of" (I, 72), one would think that he had never read Patrick Henry's speech at the opening of the Continental Congress of 1774, in which he declared that British oppression and the revolution against it had swept away all colonial lines and made the inhabitants of the colonies one people—the American people. I cannot, moreover, escape from the impression that the author was too anxious to find one steady advance from provincial to national views, customs and laws. He does not seem to recognize sufficiently the zigzags in that course—the periods of rapid and radical advance, and then those of retrogression.

Professor Thorpe's study of the characteristics and the movements of the population of the American states is highly interesting and instructive. These chapters and paragraphs are welcome resting places between some of his discussions of legal and political developments, which are far less satisfactory parts of the work. The chapter on the altruistic tendencies of the democracy of the West is especially suggestive. On the whole, his book will be most useful to the experienced lawyer and publicist and to the university student. It is not a book for beginners or for general readers; for it requires much knowledge to understand it and a great deal of independent judgment to draw profit from its perusal. Statistically it is very good; scientifically it is loose; philosophically it is rather crude; and from a literary point of view it is not a great success.

Of Mrs. Dixon's book about two-thirds are devoted to the history of the slavery question down to the year 1854, and about one-third to the enactment of the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854. In the first part of the work there is nothing new whatsoever: it is the orthodox slaveholder's view of that history, rather loosely and clumsily written. The

second part is filled chiefly with long quotations, drawn from the *Congressional Globe*, of the debates in the Senate upon Mr. Douglas's bill. It contains almost nothing in regard to the passage of the bill through the House of Representatives and the extraordinary parliamentary leadership of Alexander H. Stephens in driving it through the Committee of the Whole and then the House. But for the very astute manipulations of parliamentary rules by Stephens, it is highly probable that this bill would never have reached the president. Popular opinion was becoming very hostile; and, had the opposition been able to delay the action of the House a few days' longer, it is probable that that opinion could not have been faced down. This is, then, too important a chapter to be omitted from the history of the measure.

On one point Mrs. Dixon's book makes what may be regarded as a contribution to the history of the subject. It has been recorded by Ex-Secretary Gideon Welles, on the basis of a letter from Mr. Montgomery Blair, that Senator Archibald Dixon announced his amendment to the Douglas bill, which was to make the Douglas bill repeal the Missouri Compromise Act of 1820 in regard to the prohibition of slavery in the Louisiana territory above 36° 30', at the suggestion of Mr. Seward. The author of the book, however, produces a letter of Mr. Dixon to the editor of the *St. Louis Republican*, under date of November 14, 1873, in which Mr. Dixon denies that there was any conversation between Mr. Seward and himself respecting his amendment to the Douglas bill "previous to the offering of the amendment." If we give this evidence full credence, it proves only that Mr. Seward did not make the suggestion to Mr. Dixon: it does not prove that Mr. Seward did not tell Mr. Blair that he made it. It cannot be claimed, however, that it is the duty of Mr. Dixon's biographer to clear up this point.

Stanwood's *History of the Presidency* is an expansion of the author's *History of Presidential Elections*. The original work contained a most convenient collection of facts which, down to the time of the disputed election of 1876, had never been brought together in a single volume or in a single treatise. The new volume contains, in addition, the facts of the elections since that date, down to and including the very last. The author seems to have taken great pains to establish his facts and to have been successful.

Besides this very valuable statistical matter, the author has endeavored to trace briefly the origin and careers of political parties, and also to state the principal policies and measures connected with the

different administrations. In regard to his statement of policies and measures he has, again, written quite successfully, though briefly. His history of parties is not so satisfactory. Much allowance should be made, of course, for the lack of sufficient space; but besides being brief, his account is rather superficial. This is, it seems to me, especially true and especially regrettable in the treatment of the Republican Party. The real character of the Kansas-Nebraska Act and its influence in determining the creed of the Republican Party do not seem to me to be fully, or even correctly, set forth. When it comes to statements of general principles and scientific conclusions, the book is not of great value. In fact, it impresses me as being a little reckless. Taken as a whole, however, it is a welcome contribution to political literature.

J. W. BURGESS.

The Philosophical Theory of the State. By Bernard Bosanquet.
London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1899. — xviii, 342 pp.

The Anglo-Saxon mind (to use a term whose current vogue is matched only by its vagueness) has never manifested much capacity for the more abstract forms of political speculation. British and American theorists have almost all, in the search for ultimate political truth, stopped short of the field in which Continental philosophers have exhibited their greatest feats of transcendental acrobatics and dialectic legerdemain. That German idealism might, however, be usefully blended with the more practical English thought, was appreciated by the late Professor T. H. Green, who embodied this conviction in his *Principles of Political Obligation*. Green's writings, unfortunately, are as German in style as they are in thought, and are desperately hard reading. Many of the best and most striking features of his theory have been put in attractive form by his pupils, especially Professor Ritchie; and Mr. Bosanquet presents the work before us as a restatement of Green's views on many points, supplemented and brought down to date by the suggestions of recent psychological and sociological discussion. The book is wholly philosophical in content: whatever may be the practical applications that may be made of it, they play no part here. The author is occupied solely with framing formulas through which the fundamental relations of political society may be logically explained.

The central thesis of the work is the absolute unity of the individual and the state: to set up such an antithesis as "the individual *versus* the state" is, it asserts, irrational. The end of man, the demonstra-